

Minutes of a Regular Meeting

Approved 3/13/03

Town of Los Altos Hills PLANNING COMMISSION

Thursday, February 27, 2003, 7:00 p.m.
Council Chambers, 26379 Fremont Road
cc: Cassettes (2) #02-03

1. ROLL CALL AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Planning Commission regular meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers at Town Hall.

Present: Chairman Vitu, Commissioners Clow, Kerns & Wong
Absent: Commissioner Cottrell

Staff: Carl Cahill, Planning Director; Debbie Pedro, Assistant Planner; Angelica Herrera, Assistant Planner; Lani Smith, Planning Secretary

2. PRESENTATIONS FROM THE FLOOR-none

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 3.1 LANDS OF MACOMBER, 25980 Vinedo Lane (182-02-ZP-SD-VAR); A request for a Site Development Permit for landscape screening, hardscape improvements, and a pool variance to encroach into the side yard setback. (staff-Debbie Pedro)

This item was introduced by staff noting, as a part of the Site Development Permit request, the applicants are proposing to redesign a previously approved pool and are requesting a variance to locate the pool two feet inside the side yard setback. She clarified the use of the "variance" as noted in the Municipal Code. Staff had provided the applicants with a comment letter dated February 4, 2003, indicating a recommendation of denial to the Planning Commission.

Gerry Macomber, 25980 Vinedo Lane, applicant, voiced disappointment in the staff findings and recommendation for denial. She discussed minor and major variance requests. She noted the house location was constrained by the lot as indicated in their findings thus the pool was constrained by the house. In 2001, the pool placement was approved but this was just a place holder added to the plans by their architect so the Town would know they intended to have a house with a pool. She further discussed new ordinances and the need to start building before the November grading moratorium went into effect. They were not focused on landscape design or pool placement as that time. She did not agree with the comparison with the Hartpotlian pool variance request. They are only asking for a two foot strip of decking within the setback. This is only a minor variance request. If they make their pool narrower, it becomes unusable for

swimming laps. She stated that granting this variance would not be setting a precedent, requesting approval.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, stated the hillside behind the pool area really needed heavy plantings now to hold the hillside. There is nothing on the plan indicating hillside plantings. Also, there are planting bed areas but nothing indicated to go into those areas. She felt the plan was incomplete.

Diane Hayford, Skyline Design Studio, 4020 Fabian Way, Palo Alto, landscape design representative, stated that the landscape plan shows screening and there will be a great deal more planting done on the property. She discussed the previous grading on the site for the house and the proposed plantings are to correct these areas which will provide a gentler slope. They are proposing walls to create a level terrace (vegetable garden). The area directly above the pool is where the largest cut exists. When they scrape off all of the material that was added and put the site back to the existing elevation, they then intend to build two new walls, one in front of the existing cut, the second wall cut slightly into the top portion of the cut so in the end they will have two walls with a more gently sloping hillside. It is their intent to put the hillside back into a condition that corrects the things that were done during construction and to plant it thoroughly, both to prevent erosion and to soften all of the hardscape that is being put into place.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Clow has read the staff's findings for denial of the variance and he has not heard anything in the applicant's presentation that would argue against the findings. He cannot support the variance. Commissioner Wong understood that the lot is very constrained and the applicants are doing their best to have a house and a pool in the back. Unfortunately, there is not enough land in the back. He did not feel this situation is affecting any neighbors, no damage to the public, asking for a way to approve the variance. He did acknowledge that the variance is not in accordance to code. Commissioner Kerns understood the applicants concern over the pool. Even though two feet does not sound like much, it opens the door for more requests. He could not support the variance request. Chairman Vitu also understood the request. However, there are no findings for the variance for this pool configuration.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Clow and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to approve the Site Development Permit for landscape screening and hardscape improvements, Lands of Macomber, 2980 Vinedo Lane, and deny the pool variance to encroach into the side yard setback, with the recommended conditions of approval and variance findings.

AYES: Chairman Vitu, Commissioners Kerns & Clow
NOES: Commissioner Wong
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

This item is subject to a 23 day appeal period.

3.2 LANDS OF SHANTZ & SIMON, 13561 Hill Way (161-02-ZP-SD); A request to modify the Site Development Permit for a secondary dwelling unit approved at a Fast Track meeting on November 5, 2002. (staff-Debbie Pedro)

Staff introduced this item by providing information regarding the original approval at a Fast Track meeting and the Town's grading policy. The applicant's are requesting a modification to the original approval to raise the finish floor height of the building by 36" which requires approval by the Planning Commission as the proposed modification is not in strict conformance with the Town's grading policy. According to the applicant, raising the finish floor level would reduce the height of the concrete retaining walls for the stairs leading to the structure on the downhill slope. It will also reduce the amount of soil excavation from 165 cubic yards to 57 cubic yards, minimizing potential damage to the 16" and 20" oak trees located immediately east of the proposed structure. The Commission can approve grading levels that deviate from the guidelines. In addition, it was brought to staff's attention recently that portions of this property are identified in the General Plan Land Use diagram as an Open Space conservation area. The General Plan calls for the preservation of open space conservation areas through careful regulation of development combined with conservation easements. Because of the heavy vegetation cover, the flood plain, and the steep ravine leading down to Adobe Creek which runs along the edge of the north property line, staff is recommending a condition of approval to require a conservation easement to be dedicated on the lower portion of the lot, as outlined on the site plan.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Patrick Finnigan, 2142 University Avenue, Mountain View, project architect, agreed with the staff presentation. He was just informed of the conservation easement request and he did not feel the applicants would have a problem with the request.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Kerns supported staff's recommendation with the added condition for a conservation easement. Commissioner Clow also agreed as well as Commissioner Wong. Chairman Vitu also agreed noting this provides a better design.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Kerns and seconded by Commissioner Clow to approve the modification to the approved Site Development Permit for a secondary unit approved at a Fast Track meeting on November 5, 2002, Lands of Shantz and Simon, 13561 Hill Way, with the recommended conditions of approval with an added condition as follows: a conservation easement shall be placed over a portion of the property as shown on the site plan.

AYES: Chairman Vitu, Commissioners Wong, Clow & Kerns
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

This item is subject to a 23 day appeal period.

3.3 LANDS OF LEUNG, 27168 Moody Court (235-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan. (staff-Debbie Pedro)

Staff introduced this item by making corrections to the staff report regarding the MDA/MFA numbers. The correct numbers are MDA 15,232 and MFA 8,071. Staff received an e-mail from the neighbor at 27168 Moody Court requesting that adequate screening be provided between the two properties. The applicant is proposing to install 11 birch trees along the fence line to mitigate the view impact.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Sylvia Leung, 25386 La Loma Court, applicant, stated she had shown the landscape plan to her neighbor prior to his trip out of the country and she has responded to his e-mail regarding installing the 11 birch trees which are fast growing trees that will reach 30 to 40 feet at maturity.

Commissioner Clow questioned this highly visible house requesting additional information regarding the type of trees being planted and the need for fast growing trees. He also questioned the use of white paint on the retaining wall on the driveway. He requested the use of the same reflectivity value used on visible houses.

Raymond Leung, 25386 La Loma Court, applicant, felt the wall color was beige, not white although he felt there would be no problem complying with the reflectivity value of 50% or less, using a darker earth tone color.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, was hoping to suggest the planting of rosemary on the wall for screening but there is a drainage area directly behind the wall which prohibits it. She provided a range of plantings to be used to hold up the hillside. Also, the slope to the right as you are going up has been denuded of plantings and in need of heavy plantings and re-vegetated. Another location of concern is just to the right of the carport which needs to be re-vegetated.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Wong felt this was a reasonable plan. The wall does need to conform with the reflectivity value used for highly visible new construction. Commissioner Kerns had no problem with the landscape plan, preferring a darker color on the wall. Commissioner Clow felt there was a need for heavy screening in such a way that it would not effect the views of the applicant. There are six redwood trees listed on the landscape plan, showing only five. He requested the addition of two redwoods on the north side of the court yard, and replace the two redbuds located east of the circular courtyard with two redwood trees. He agreed with Sandy Humphries' recommendation for landscaping on the slope below the driveway, and the color of the retaining wall to be consistent with the reflectivity value of highly visible new construction. Chairman Vitu also agreed with the reflectivity value for the retaining wall as it is very visible from off site. Also, if the applicants can use hanging plants it would help with mitigation.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Clow and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to approve the Site Development Permit for landscape screening, Lands of Leung, 27168 Moody Court, with the following additions/changes to the conditions of approval: (1) The retaining wall along the driveway shall have a light reflectivity value of 50 or less. (2) Two proposed redbud trees located east of the circular courtyard, as shown on the planting plan (L8), shall be replaced by two redwood trees. (3) Two additional redwood trees shall be planted north of the circular courtyard, as shown on the approved plans. (4) Hanging plants shall be installed along the left of the driveway to mitigate the view impact of the retaining wall. (5) The bare slopes north of the driveway shall be revegetated with groundcover.

AYES: Chairman Vitu, Commissioners Wong, Kerns & Clow

NOES: None

ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

The applicant was in agreement with the changes as long as they are feasible (to be determined by staff).

This item is subject to a 23 day appeal period.

- 3.4 LANDS OF MEHTA, 14293 Saddle Mountain Drive (291-01-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 1,452 square foot addition (maximum height 25.6 feet), and a 997 square foot secondary dwelling unit (maximum height 17.6 feet). (staff-Angelica Herrera)

Staff introduced this item by stating although the application does meet all of the Zoning and Site Development ordinances, it had substantial neighbor opposition regarding views and privacy which has been addressed in conditions #1, #2, and #3. There was also a concern from a neighbor regarding storm water runoff which the applicant has partially addressed by adding three additional drains on the south side of the main house as well as consulting that neighbor in the landscape screening plan review.

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Sharad Mehta, 14293 Saddle Mountain Drive, applicant, noted he had built his house in 1988, requesting a two story home but only received approval for a one story structure at that time. Now his needs have increased. He is only requesting an additional 2,000 square feet; 1,000 square feet on the second story, and 1,000 square feet single story on the back. He provided a document with signatures from neighbors in support of his project. He also noted that he has made adjustments to the plan according to neighbors' requests. He is not proposing any additional exterior lighting. He will maintain privacy. Regarding the Chan's, their house is two story which is above his house. Regarding his existing driveway, he had to open it up to accommodate the garage truck and emergency vehicles. He further noted that they will be complying with the request for obscure glass on the northeasterly side of the second story and replace the clear glass fixtures with frosted glass or shielded light fixtures. He would like to keep the asphalt curb and all plantings in the circular area, just removing the lights.

Lorin Nelson, 247 Clarke Avenue, Livermore, project architect, provided a planter profile to the Commission to help mitigate some of the neighbors views. He discussed the Chan's concerns regarding the garage addition with the 25 foot unidentified tree species. The Chan's would have a filtered view. He further discussed the windows requesting not to eliminate them but to make them smaller (need for ventilation, light, and to break up the wall).

June Dean, 27677 Lupine Road, discussed the major water runoff which has never been addressed properly when the house was built. At her own expense, she had to install a huge swale. She would like to make sure any additional water runoff is handled correctly. Also, the second story addition and deck will look down on two of her bedrooms and pool area. Mr. Mehta has assured her that he would handle any drainage/water problems. It was staff's opinion that Mr. Metha has addressed her concerns (condition #10).

Mr. Chan, 14295 Saddle Mountain Drive, addressed the following: view impact and obstructions; invasion of privacy; light pollution; and construction traffic and parking. He had met with Mr. Mehta on several occasions to discuss their concerns. He felt Mr. Mehta consistently disregards property line and building codes. He further discussed his application process during his site development process and his design going through extensive modifications to address issues raised by the Mehta's. He asked that the 4th garage area be eliminated as well as the second story additions. He suggested an area farther away where landscape screening is possible without blocking his views. Additions facing his private living areas at close distance are unacceptable. He also asked that the planter be cut back to the property line, the exterior light fixtures currently placed on his property be remove, and for the removal of structures that are in the setback areas, if against code. He provided photos of the area which addressed privacy and headlight issues.

Amy Chan, 14295 Saddle Mountain Drive, stated when they built their house in 1994, they had to make many changes to the plan to satisfy Mr. Mehta. They even moved the house back 17 feet. Now, when they met with Mr. Mehta regarding their concerns, nothing has been addressed. She requested the elimination of the second story (privacy issues) and the removal of the planter area in the driveway makes it appear to be a circular driveway.

Dot Schreiner, 14301 Saddle Mountain Drive, stated she was on the Planning Commission during the time the Chan's applied for a site development permit. The Chan's were requested to make many changes to their project and they even made more changes after approval to accommodate Mr. Mehta. She addressed the setback issue, noting the 30 foot setback was grandfathered and with the new expansion, the setback should revert back to 40 feet (must adhere to current rules). Portions of the second story are not 40 feet from the road. Therefore, the Mehta's should request a variance or it should not be allowed.

Carol Gottlieb, 24290 Summerhill Avenue, was also a Planning Commissioner at the time of the Chan project and many changes were made to keep the house lower and to maintain views. She did not feel it was fair now for the Mehta's to impact the neighbors. She also questioned the parking space for the secondary unit.

Kim Tam, 14297 Saddle Mountain Drive, stated this is a neighborhood of two story homes. He was in support of the Mehta project.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, suggested making the questionable windows higher to address privacy issues. Also, a high hedging works well for preventing lights from a vehicle. She further discussed the planting of redwood trees in a triangle which helps them grow faster. Also, English Oak trees grow tall and narrow.

Mr. Chan further discussed Mr. Meht's history of disregard to code.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Vitu asked for clarification regarding setbacks on this property. Discussion ensued.

RE-OPEN PUBLIC HEARING

Lorin Nelson, architect, stated when the original grading and drainage plan was prepared, they had followed the rules regarding setbacks. The 40 feet was taken from the terminus of Saddle Mountain Drive. Reference was made to Attachment 3.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

It was clarified that staff did not know of any problems with the septic system and the applicant received approval from the Santa Clara County Health Department.

Commissioner Kerns felt this was a difficult application. He would like to see the Mehta's do more for the Chan's. However, they are within code so it would be hard to deny the second story. Staff has done a good job regarding mitigating conditions. He liked Sandy's suggestion regarding higher windows for privacy issues. The landscape plan could return to the Commission for review. Commissioner Clow felt the setback issue had been addressed. The Chan and Mehta residences are close to the same height and both are two story. He felt the project was within Town ordinances. He could support the project. He asked that the curb, per staff recommendation, be removed. Commissioner Wong also agreed with the suggestion to modify the windows. Chairman Vitu was sympathetic with the Chan's but both have two stories. There are privacy issues which staff has addressed in the conditions of approval. The Chans had expressed to her the desire to have the pavement in the ingress/egress restored to gravel although she was not sure anyone was allowed to upgrade in that area. The Planning Director indicated that both property owners would have to agree on the change. Referring to the conditions of approval, she asked how they can assure these conditions are met which was answered by the Planning Director noting the corrections to the previously approved plans would need to be corrected prior to submittal for building plan check. Also, the unshielded lighting is a public nuisance per Town code and would also need to be corrected.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Kerns and seconded by Commissioner Wong to approve the Site Development Permit for an addition, and a secondary dwelling unit, Lands of Mehta, 14293 Saddle Mountain Drive, with the following addition/changes to the conditions of approval: (1) The landscape plan shall return to the Planning Commission for review and approval. (2) The applicant shall install obscure glass on all windows located on the northeasterly side of the second story. All windows, with the exception of the one window at the bathroom, shall be located directly below the roof eave on the northeasterly side of the second story. (3) The site drainage associated with the proposed development must be designed as surface flow wherever possible to avoid concentration of the runoff and must direct water runoff away from Lupine Road.

AYES: Chairman Vitu, Commissioners Clow, Wong & Kerns
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

This item is subject to a 23 day appeal period.

- 3.5 LANDS OF CORRIGAN, 13441 Robleda Road (192-02-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit and review of an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration for replacement of an existing driveway and bridge. (staff-Angelica Herrera)

Chairman Vitu and Commissioner Kerns disclosed that since they received a political contribution from the applicants in excess of \$250, they were unable to vote on the project. Since Commissioner Cottrell was absent, they did not have a quorum for voting purposes.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Clow and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to continue the application to the next Planning Commission meeting on March 13, 2003.

AYES: Chairman Vitu, Commissioners Kerns, Wong & Clow
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

- 3.6 LANDS OF ASKARI, 27830 Elena Road (Lot C) (135-02-ZP-SD-GD-VAR); A request for a Site Development Permit for a 5,704 square foot new residence (maximum height 27 feet), and a variance to exceed the 27 foot height maximum as measured from the previous existing natural grade determined at the time of Tentative Map approval. (staff-Angelica Herrera)

Staff introduced this item by reviewing condition #1 of the Site Development Permit for the grading stating "the placement of fill on Parcel C exceeds the Town's maximum allowable fill differential of 3 feet and that the height of any proposed structure will be measured from the previous existing grade that was determined at the time of tentative map approval".

OPENED PUBLIC HEARING

Bruce Askari, 27830 Elena Road, applicant, provided "a request for variance" for review as follows: (1) The proposed plan does meet all the Town's ordinances and the height limitation if measured from the existing ground. We are not asking for anything above or beyond what the ordinances allow. In fact, Parcel B has an identical floor plan with exact height and it was approved by the Town. (2) The proposed plan could have been built on the higher ground where there is no fill. It would not have required a variance. The result would be a 9-foot higher structure because the ground is higher by 9-feet. (3) The proposed site is the lowest part of the property. The result is a lower structure and would yield a lower height even with the fill. (4) This variance does make sense. It generates lower height because it is situated in the lowest area. It meets the spirit of the height ordinance by creating a lower structure. (5) One of our neighbors requested this. Even though it does require a variance, we decided to honor their request. (6) We do have support of all neighbors. They fully support the proposed plan. (7) With respect to the fill, it is a great natural looking site. It compliments the surrounding area. The neighbors love it. This area was excavated by one of the previous owners who built up the road with the excavated soil. It looks fantastic. He further discussed condition #17, noting the "and" should be "or". Staff will clarify this condition.

Carol Gottlieb, 24290 Summerhill Avenue, stated the applicant was allowed to fill because of the condition. Fill had been dumped illegally in the beginning. The Commission gave him permission to fill up to 7' to 8' and that permission was granted on the fact that the height of the home would be to natural grade. The applicant accepted that condition. Now he is coming in saying he needs to build his house 27 feet from the existing grade. She felt the original condition should be honored.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, noted she attended the subdivision meeting indicating there is a big drainage swale in the center of this property and the concern was, allowing the fill, that people would come in some time later and want to fill in the drainage swale to increase the availability of their land.

Bruce Askari stated that when the subdivision was approved there was no restriction on the height of the building, and the subdivision improvement plan clearly indicated the finished grade and it was done in accordance to the laws. Jeff Peterson had signed off the drawing. This was a one time fill. The first time they came in was because there was no subdivision approval. The second time was because the grading did not show the scope of the contour. The end result is that the variance will give everyone a lower building.

Carol Gottlieb, 24290 Summerhill Avenue, stated they did not know there would be fill at the subdivision stage, it came after the subdivision was approved.

CLOSED PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Vitu had the minutes from the April 12, 2001 meeting when they were discussing the issue of fill and it was confusing. There was a signature by Jeff Peterson. She did not feel Mr. Askari was intentionally dumping illegally and thought he had approval and did not so it was brought back to the Commission. At that time all of the Commissioners agreed that the grading

that was being done on the property was making it more natural and was an improvement to the property. In addition, he had spoils from the sanitary sewer system which was benefiting a great number of people and they were trying to avoid all the export from the property. Commissioner Wong is looking at this as an application for a new house. He could support the project. Commissioner Clow looked at the specific findings in granting a variance. He felt this was a unique situation where the original contours were unnatural where it was because it was excavated ages ago or for some reason they do not understand. This is an unique situation where it has been filled to what is now more natural contours. Now they would be deprived from privileges of constructing an ordinary house on what appeared to be the natural contours. There are exceptional and extraordinary circumstances. He reviewed the remaining findings noting positive findings of support for the remainder. Commissioner Kerns voiced support of the application. He felt the applicant has improved the original drainage and agreed with Commissioners Wong and Clow. He requested a verification and/or modification of wording for condition #17. Commissioner Vitu also was in support of the application with the variance findings.

Staff provided variance findings for #1 and #2 as follows: (1) The location of Lot C adjacent to Highway 280 and situated below Elena Road provides a low profile and essentially an invisible location for the proposed main residence. Granting the height Variance would allow the best usage of Lot C's current topography and would reduce the potential visual impacts posed by situating the proposed new residence at another location on the subject property. The site of the new residence is proposed at the lowest flat pad located on Lot C. Surrounding residences are situated at similar elevations and have similar building heights as the proposed new residence with the proposed height Variance. (2) The granting of the height Variance will preserve the intent and purpose of the height ordinance, which is to minimize negative environmental, visual or aesthetic impacts on neighboring properties and the public at large.

Staff will review the swale area, per request.

MOTION SECONDED AND PASSED: Motion by Commissioner Wong and seconded by Commissioner Kerns to approve the Site Development Permit for a new residence and variance to exceed the 27 foot height maximum as measured from the previous existing natural grade determined at the time of Tentative Map approval, Lands of Askari, 27830 Elena Road (lot C), with the following additions/changes to the conditions of approval: clarify and/or modify wording in #17; and to include findings as stated by staff.

AYES: Chairman Vitu, Commissioners Kerns, Wong & Clow
NOES: None
ABSENT: Commissioner Cottrell

This item is subject to a 23 day appeal period.

4. OLD BUSINESS

4.1 Report from subcommittees-none

5. NEW BUSINESS

5.1 Planning Commission Study Session of proposed "View and Sunlight Protection" Ordinance

The Planning Director introduced this item noting this is only a study session and will be noticed for public hearing for March 13, 2003. On January 16, 2003, City Council reviewed the Town of Tiburon View and Sunlight Protection Ordinance and determined that it was an appropriate model to use for the Town. The Council then directed staff to prepare the appropriate ordinance for review by the Planning Commission. Staff is recommending that the view protection ordinance be incorporated as a subsection of Article 8 of the Site Development Ordinance, "Landscaping". He further reviewed the Tiburon View Ordinance and the proposed ordinance. Commissioner Kerns stated the Tiburon ordinance included the 'guiding principles' which is missing in the Town proposed ordinance and should be included. Discussion ensued.

Sandy Humphries, Environmental Design Committee, felt the proposed ordinance should go farther as building and structures also block views. She recommended reviewing Rancho Palos Verdes ordinance regarding the same subject which has even been tested in court. She felt redwood trees should be removed from the "undesirable trees" section as they are not a fire hazard. She will provide copies of the Rancho Palos Verdes ordinance to the Commissioners.

Discussion continued regarding the following: the differences between Tiburon and the Town of Los Altos Hills, the possible litigation and/or just removing the tree; one persons view obstruction and another persons screening; the chopping down trees rather than litigation (chainsaw ordinance); the trees themselves are part of the view; and Town wide mailing for the City Council agenda. It was requested that the Environmental Design Committee to review and provide input for the 3/13 meeting. Commissioner Clow will work on the wording for Section 10-2.8.1.07. Commissioner Kerns was concerned with the long term impact of the ordinance.

6. REPORT FROM THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING

6.1 Planning Commission Representative for January 16th, Commissioner Wong, provided an overview of the meeting.

6.2 Planning Commission Representative for February 6th, Commissioner Kerns, reported on the following item: discussion of Pathway Committee Membership.

6.3 Planning Commission Representative for February 20th, Commissioner Clow, reported on the following: view ordinance; priority with the Housing Element; and conservation easement.

6.4 Planning Commission Representative for March 6th – Commissioner Cottrell

6.5 Planning Commission Representative for March 20th – Commissioner Kerns

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

7.1 Approval of January 9, 2003 minutes

8. REPORT FROM FAST TRACK MEETING- JANUARY 28, FEBRUARY 11, & 25, 2003

- 8.1 LANDS OF LIU, 12690 La Cresta Drive (219-02-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a new residence. Approved with conditions.
- 8.2 LANDS OF VEERENA, 25665 O'Keefe Lane (190-02-ZP-SD-GD); A request for a Site Development Permit for an addition and pool. Approved with conditions.
- 8.3 LANDS OF BRANDMAN, 27686 Natoma Road (241-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a new residence and pool. Approved with conditions.

9. REPORT FROM SITE DEVELOPMENT MEETING-JANUARY 14, 21, 28, & FEBRUARY 11, 2003

- 9.1 LANDS OF CLEAGE, 26140 Rancho Manuella (247-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan. Approved with conditions.
- 9.2 LANDS OF CALIFORNIA WATER, 24752 Olive Tree Lane (267-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for one 10-foot pole with two antennas and one 6-foot pole with one antenna on top of an existing water storage tank. Approved with conditions.
- 9.3 LANDS OF RENO & BRYANT, 25615 Fernhill Drive (250-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan. Approved with conditions.
- 9.4 LANDS OF PARVARANDEH, 27210 Ohlone Lane (153-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a swimming pool. Approved with conditions.
- 9.5 LANDS OF HERH, 15472 Vista Serena (229-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for an addition with a basement under the addition. Approved with conditions.
- 9.6 LANDS OF SCHILLING, 13650 Paseo Del Roble (243-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan and hardscape improvements. Approved with conditions.
- 9.7 LANDS OF KIZHEPAT & GOVIND, 24201 Hillview Drive (263-02-ZP-SD); A request for a Site Development Permit for a landscape screening plan. Approved with conditions.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by consensus at 10:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lani Smith
Planning Secretary